

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-10 are pending. Claims 1-9 have been rejected. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended and claim 10 is added. The amendments to claim 1 made by Applicant were made to place the present application in better form for examination and allowance. Therefore, the foregoing amendments do not narrow the scope of the pending claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

A. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being allegedly anticipated by Vanhoof et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,566). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Vanhoof et al. fails to disclose all the claimed features, as required by Section 102. For example, Vanhoof et al. fails to disclose at least features of a slave-logic configured to control a writing operation of the data-FIFO and count the length of the receiving data until an end-tap signal is inputted, a length-FIFO configured to store the data length counted by the slave-logic and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Vanhoof et al. fails to disclose a CPU configured to continuously read the data stored in the data-FIFO as much as the data read from the length-FIFO when an interrupt signal is inputted from the slave-logic and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

Vanhoof et al. relates to an interprocess communication protocol system that provides a generic communication system for communication between specified processes in a complex digital system. In the portion of the applied patent referred to in the Office Action, col. 25, lines 43-46 refers to a Transmit Data Source where the modem transmits the contents of a 67 byte FIFO 550 (see FIG. 11). If the FIFO 550 is filled with static data (e.g. a text message), the

Amdt. dated January 23, 2004

Reply to Office Action of October 29, 2003

modem transmits this message continuously. Neither this portion of Vanhoof et al. nor any other portion appears to disclose a length-FIFO configured to store the data length counted by the slave-logic, nor does it disclose to count the length of the receiving data until an end-tap signal is inputted.

Additionally, col. 20, lines 28-39 of Vanhoof et al. discloses a transmitter side 520 having a plurality of slave transmitter channels 522A, 522B, 522C with spreaders and a master transmitter channel 524 having an upconverter. Again, this portion of Vanhoof et al. fails to teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed features as discussed above.

Consequently, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Vanhoof et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the claimed features of independent claim 1, as required by Section 102. Claims 2-5 are dependent claims that depend upon independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1 as well as for their additionally recited features.

Independent claim 6 recites an inter-processor communication method of a mobile communication system comprising storing received data in a first region, counting the length of the received data stored in the first region, checking whether an end tag is received, storing the counted data length in a second region when the end tag is received and outputting an interrupt signal to a CPU, and continuously reading the data stored in the first region by the CPU as much as the data length stored in the second region.

Col. 48, lines 8-11 of Vanhoof et al. discloses that the C model of the FIFO is an infinite loop that performs an unblocked read and an unblocked write every iteration. In col. 35, lines

12-37, the Programmable Mobile Communication Modem (PMCM) generates a Tx interrupt every 8 bits. Internally, the DSP maintains a FIFO of 67 bytes and this is used to buffer between the UART or the ISA interface (which supplies the data) and the PMCM. Again, Vanhoof et al. fails to teach or suggest storing received data in a first region and counting the length of the receiving data stored in the first region. The FIFO in Vanhoof et al. is set to maintain 67 bytes of data. Figure 12 in Vanhoof et al. depicts a timing diagram for the generic interprocessor communication protocol. In col. 48, lines 13-15, Vanhoof et al. simply states that the 'str' and 'ack' signals are explicitly checked to maintain IO and FIFO integrity.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Vanhoof et al. of at least checking whether an end tag is received and storing the counted data length in a second region when the end tag is received and outputting an interrupt signal to a CPU and combinations thereof as recited in claim 6.

The corresponding description of Figure 12 of Vanhoof et al. appears in col. 39, lines 28-52. The description states that:

1. After the request has been recognized, the writing device stabilizes the data.
2. Next, the strobe 'str' signal is pulled up.
3. The reading device maintains the 'ack' signal down, otherwise no transfer occurs.
4. The reading device samples the strobe 'str' signal until it is high. The strobe 'str' makes an up-transition in this situation.
5. The reading device then samples the data.
6. The reading device pulls up the 'ack' signal.

Amdt. dated January 23, 2004

Reply to Office Action of October 29, 2003

7. Meanwhile, the reading device continuously samples the 'ack' signal, and when 'ack' goes high, the reading device pulls 'str' down again. The 'ack' signal only makes an up-transition in this situation.

8. The writing device then releases the data bus and the I/O function is complete.

9. Meanwhile, the reading device watches the strobe 'str' until it goes down, then the reading device finishes the I/O function, leaving the 'ack' signal high.

Again, Vanhoof et al. fails to disclose checking whether an end tag is received, storing the counted data length in a second region when the end tag is received and outputting an interrupt signal to a CPU and combinations thereof as recited in claim 6.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Vanhoof et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the claimed features of independent claim 6, as required by Section 102. Claims 7-9 are dependent claims that depend upon independent claim 6 and are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 6 as well as their additionally recited features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S. § 102 is respectfully requested.

B. Claim 10 is newly added by this Amendment and believed to be in condition for allowance.

Serial No. 09/801,639

Docket No. P-195

Amdt. dated January 23, 2004

Reply to Office Action of October 29, 2003

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **CARL R. WESOLOWSKI**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski  
Registration No. 40,372

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 502-9440 DYK/CRW/JLC:sbh:cre

**Date: January 23, 2004**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**